## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-6 and 8-21 are currently pending in the application, with newly added Claim 21. Claim 7 has been canceled. Claims 1, 8, 9, 11-15 and 16 are presently amended. Claims 7-11 and 16-20 were indicated as allowable by the Examiner, but objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 1-6 and 12-15 were rejected by the Examiner. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 7-11 were indicated as allowable if rewritten. Claim 7 has been canceled. Claim 8 has been amended to depend from Claim 1. Claims 9, 11, and 14 have been amended and written in independent form, including all of the limitations of base claim 1. Claims 10, 12, 13, and new Claim 21 depend directly or indirectly from newly amended independent Claim 9. Claims 15-20 depend directly or indirectly from newly amended independent Claim 14. As a result, it is requested that the objection be withdrawn for Claims 9-21 and that the claims be placed in line for allowance.

Claims 1-6 and 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,101,991 to Glover in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,086,885 to Noguchi et al. As discussed above, Claims 12-13 now depend from newly amended independent Claim 9 which the Examiner indicated would be allowable. It is therefore believed that Claims 12 and 13 should now be placed in line for allowance.

With regard to Claim 1, it has been amended to include the limitations of now canceled Claim 7 which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if written in independent form utilizing the limitations of Claim 1. Claims 2-6 and 8 depend from Claim 1. As a result, it is requested that the rejection be withdrawn for Claims 1-6 and 8 and that the claims be placed in line for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/659,841

Amdt. Dated: 22 April 2005

Reply to Office Action of 04 February 2005

With regard to Claim 11, it is newly amended to incorporate the limitations of Claim 1, and therefore, should now be in line for allowance.

With regard to Claim 14, and Claims 15-20 which depend therefrom, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Neither the '885 patent nor the '991 patent show an arrangement of a fuel nozzle downstream of the butterfly valve. Further, Claim 14 now incorporates the limitations of Claim 1, as amended, which includes the limitations of now canceled Claim 7, and as a result, Claim 14 and its dependent Claim 15-20 should be allowable as well.

The Applicant believes that all claims should now be in line for allowance. The Applicant has attempted to be fully responsive to the office action. However, if the Examiner believes that such would be helpful, he is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert W. Becker, Reg. 26,255

Attorney for Applicant(s)

ROBERT W. BECKER & ASSOCIATES

707 Highway 66 East, Suite B Tijeras, New Mexico 87059

Telephone: 505 286 3511

Telefax:

505 286 3524

RWB:KCF:rac